

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR
2
3
4
5
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 BROOKE MARTIN,

11 Plaintiff,

v.

12 LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

14 CASE NO. C20-1728-JCC

ORDER

15 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for partial summary judgment
16 (Dkt. No. 8) and Defendants' cross-motion¹ for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 10). Having
17 considered the parties' briefing and the relevant record, and finding oral argument unnecessary,
18 the Court hereby DENIES Plaintiff's motion (Dkt. No. 8) and GRANTS Defendants' cross-
19 motion (Dkt. No. 10) for the reasons explained herein.

20

21 ¹ Plaintiff objects to the Court's consideration of Defendants' cross-motion because
22 Defendants failed to include a noting date in the caption, as required by Local Civil Rule 7(b)(1)
23 and (k). (*See* Dkt. No. 16 at 1–2.) The Court OVERRULES this objection. Defendants included
24 the noting date in the Court's electronic filing system, Plaintiff received immediate notice, and
25 Defendants also corrected the error by praecipe the following day. (*See* Dkt. No. 12.) This
26 provided Plaintiff adequate notice of the cross-motion. Because Plaintiff had actual notice of the
cross-motion, the noting date, and the deadline for responding, Plaintiff's objection boils down to
a complaint about the form of the notice. But, “[a] local rule imposing a requirement of form
must not be enforced in a way that causes a party to lose a substantive right because of a
nonwillful failure to comply.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 83(a)(2).

1 **I. BACKGROUND**

2 Plaintiff was injured while riding as a passenger in a vehicle owned by Mal, Inc. and
3 driven by its employee, Zenin Gerhing. (Dkt. Nos. 8 at 2, 10 at 2–3.) At the time, Defendants
4 provided liability and underinsured motorist coverage on the vehicle. (*Id.*) Plaintiff has alleged
5 liability claims against Mal, Inc. and Mr. Gerhing in another suit, which Defendants are
6 defending under a reservation of rights. (*Id.*)

7 Because Plaintiff believes that Defendants may ultimately disclaim liability coverage for
8 her injuries, she seeks compensation based on Defendants' underinsured motorist policy. (Dkt.
9 No. 1-3.) Following Defendants' denial of her underinsured motorist claim, Plaintiff filed the
10 instant complaint in King County Superior Court seeking, among other things, a declaratory
11 judgment that she is, in fact, covered under Mal, Inc.'s underinsured motorist policy. (*Id.*; *see*
12 Dkt. No. 11-1 at 14–17.) Defendants removed the case to this Court and then indicated in their
13 answer that underinsured motorist coverage does not apply here because the underinsured
14 motorist policy expressly states that it does not apply to a vehicle covered under Mal, Inc.'s
15 liability policy, which Defendants assert is the case here. (Dkt. No. 7 at 3.)

16 Plaintiff now moves for partial summary judgment solely on her declaratory judgment
17 claim. (Dkt. No. 8.) Defendants cross-move for summary judgment, arguing that the uninsured
18 motorist policy does not apply to the truck at issue here. (Dkt. No. 10.)

19 **II. DISCUSSION**

20 **A. Legal Standard**

21 The Court will “grant summary judgment if the movant shows that there is no genuine
22 dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R.
23 Civ. P. 56(a). A fact is material if it “might affect the outcome of the suit under the governing
24 law,” and a dispute of fact is genuine if “the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return
25 a verdict for the nonmoving party.” *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). It
26 is undisputed that, for purposes of the motions presently before the Court, there are no material

1 disputed facts. (*Compare* Dkt. No. 8 at 2–3, *with* Dkt. No. 10 at 2–3.) Correspondingly,
 2 resolution of this matter turns solely on the Court’s review and interpretation of the applicable
 3 underinsured motorist policy.

4 **B. Underinsured Motorist Policy**

5 Plaintiff asserts that Defendants have, to date, denied liability coverage for the accident
 6 because Mr. Gehring may not have been authorized by his employer to operate the vehicle at the
 7 time of the accident—a prerequisite for Defendants’ liability coverage. (Dkt. No. 8 at 2.) On this
 8 basis, Plaintiff argues that she is eligible for underinsured motorist coverage which, according to
 9 the policy, applies to a “vehicle . . . [f]or which no liability bond or policy applies at the time of
 10 an ‘accident.’” (Dkt. No. 11-1 at 10.) Similarly, the policy also provides that underinsured
 11 motorist coverage does not apply to “any vehicle . . . [f]or which the Liability Coverage of this
 12 Coverage Form *applies.*” (Dkt. No. 11-1 at 11 (emphasis added).) Plaintiff argues that since
 13 Defendants may ultimately determine that liability coverage does not *apply* here, underinsured
 14 motorist coverage for her would not be precluded. (Dkt. No. 8 at 4–8.) The Court does not find
 15 this argument persuasive.

16 First, there is no doubt that the vehicle at issue was “a covered auto” under the liability
 17 policy. (Dkt. No. 11-1 at 7.). If the vehicle were not a “covered ‘auto’” as defined in the policy,
 18 Plaintiff would not be eligible for underinsured motorist coverage. (*See id.* (underinsured policy
 19 indicating that an “insured” is someone “occupying” a “covered” auto).)

20 Second, Plaintiff’s interpretation of the policy language is inconsistent with Washington
 21 law. Defendants point to myriad Washington cases rejecting the argument that underinsured
 22 motorist coverage turns on whether or not liability insurance benefits were *actually* paid out.
 23 (*See* Dkt. No. 10 at 10–15 (citing *Blackburn v. Safeco Ins. Co.*, 794 P.2d 1259 (Wash. 1990);
 24 *Millers Cas. Ins. Co., of Tex. v. Briggs*, 665 P.2d 891 (Wash. 1983); *Churchill v. N.H. Ins. Co.*,
 25 844 P.2d 459 (Wash. Ct. App. 1993).) Instead, the cases hold that underinsured coverage applies
 26 irrespective of whether the insurer ultimately paid out under the liability policy. (*Id.*) As the

1 court noted in *Millers*:

2 Our conclusion is also dictated by common sense and the consuming public's
3 general understanding of coverage under these circumstances. The owner of a
4 vehicle purchases liability insurance to, among other things, protect passengers in
5 the vehicle from his, or another driver's, negligent driving. He purchases
underinsured motorist coverage *to protect himself and others from damages caused*
by another vehicle which is underinsured.

665 P.2d at 895 (emphasis added). The policy in *Millers* included the same exclusion provision
as here: it excluded from underinsured motorist coverage an "automobile . . . to which the
liability coverage of this policy *applies*." *Id.* at 892 (emphasis added). Accordingly, the result in
Millers should be the same as here.

Plaintiff points to no caselaw contradicting those cited by Defendants. (*See generally*
Dkt. Nos. 8, 14.) Instead, she makes irrelevant factual distinctions and suggests the Court apply
general contract interpretation principles to construe the contract policy differently. (Dkt. Nos. 8
at 4–8, 14 at 2–4.) But this approach ignores policy language that forecloses the result Plaintiff
seeks. According to the policy, underinsured motorist coverage simply does not apply to a
covered vehicle, such as the one Plaintiff was a passenger in. This is true regardless of whether
Defendants ultimately pay out under the liability policy.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion for partial summary
judgment (Dkt. No. 8) and GRANTS Defendants' cross-motion (Dkt. No. 10). Plaintiff's claims
are dismissed with prejudice. The Clerk is DIRECTED to close this case.

DATED this 10th day of March 2021.



John C. Coughenour
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE